The background of the cover features a large, light blue, five-pointed star. Inside the star is a circular seal. The seal has a blue outer ring with the text "PROBATION DEPARTMENT" at the top and "COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO" at the bottom. Inside this ring is a smaller, more ornate seal with a central emblem and the text "PROBATION DEPARTMENT" and "COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO" around it. The text "ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT 2010" is overlaid in the center of the star in a bold, dark blue font.

# **ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT 2010**

## **SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

**Mack Jenkins, Chief Probation Officer**

**SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT  
ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT 2010**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Mission, Vision, Overview.....1

Overall Juvenile Field Services.....2

Juvenile Field Services (Excluding Special Operations).....6

Juvenile Special Operations .....14

Adult Field Services.....21

Adult Gang Unit .....30

Institutional Services..... 35

# LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1. Juvenile Population Trend on the Last Day of Each Month 2008-2010.....	2
Figure 2. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Youth Supervised .....	3
Figure 3. Youth Supervised by Region .....	4
Figure 4. Youth Supervised by Programs .....	6
Figure 5. Youth Referrals by Ethnicity .....	7
Figure 6. Youth Referrals by Region .....	8
Figure 7. Youth Referrals by Crime Type .....	8
Figure 8. Youth Outcome of Referrals .....	9
Figure 9. Status and Criminal Offense (601 and 602) Petitions by Ethnicity .....	9
Figure 10. Status and Criminal Offense (601 and 602) Petitions by Region .....	10
Figure 11. Youth Petitions by Crime Type .....	10
Figure 12. Disposition of Youth Petitions Filed .....	11
Figure 13. Petitions Filed and Found True by Crime Type .....	11
Figure 14. Number of Juveniles who Recidivated 2008-2010 .....	12
Figure 15. Number of Juveniles who Left Probation 2008-2010.....	12
Figure 16. Juvenile Recidivism Rate 2008-2010 .....	13
Figure 17. Percentage of Special Operations Juveniles Supervised by Region .....	13
Figure 18. Map Showing Concentration of Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised .....	16
Figure 19. Youth Supervised in Specialized Programs .....	17
Figure 20. Youth Supervised by Crime Type .....	18
Figure 21. Map of Youth Supervised by the Gang Unit .....	20
Figure 22. Adult Population Trend on the Last Day of Each Month 2008-2010.....	21
Figure 23. Percentage of Adults Supervised by Region .....	22
Figure 24. Map Showing Concentration of Adults Supervised .....	23
Figure 25. Adults Supervised by Supervision Type .....	25
Figure 26. Percentage of Adults Supervised by Crime Type .....	26
Figure 27. Percentage of Adult Sex Offenders Supervised by Assessed Risk Level .....	26
Figure 28. Adults under Supervision – Ending Status .....	27
Figure 29. Adult Offenders on DUI Enforcement Caseloads by Region .....	27
Figure 30. Number of Adults who Recidivated 2008-2010 .....	28
Figure 31. Number of Adults who Left Probation 2008-2010.....	28

Figure 32. Adult Recidivism Rate 2008-2010 .....29

Figure 33. Percentage of Adults Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit by Region .....30

Figure 34. Map Showing Concentration of Adults Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit .....31

Figure 35. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Crime Type .....33

Figure 36. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level .....34

Figure 37. Average Daily Attendance – Juvenile Detention Facilities .....35

Figure 38. Reason for Detention at East Mesa and Kearny Mesa .....36

Figure 39. Average Daily Attendance at the Juvenile Camps .....37

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Youth Supervised by Region and Ethnicity .....	4
Table 2. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Region .....	5
Table 3. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Age .....	5
Table 4. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	5
Table 5. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Gender. ....	5
Table 6. Juvenile Supervision Program Caseload Yardstick verses Caseload Size .....	6
Table 7. Top 10 Referring Agencies of Youth to Probation .....	7
Table 8. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Region and Ethnicity .....	14
Table 9. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Region .....	15
Table 10. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Age .....	15
Table 11. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	15
Table 12. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Gender. ....	15
Table 13. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Specialized Programs .....	17
Table 14. Special Ops: Juvenile Supervision Yardstick verses Caseload Size .....	17
Table 15. Number of Gang-Involved Juveniles under Supervision by Region .....	19
Table 16. Adults Supervised by Region and Ethnicity .....	22
Table 17. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Region .....	24
Table 18. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Age .....	24
Table 19. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	24
Table 20. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Gender.....	24
Table 21. Adult Supervised by Risk Level and Supervision Type .....	25
Table 22. Adult Supervision Caseload Standard verses Caseload Size .....	25
Table 23. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Region and Ethnicity .....	30
Table 24. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Region .....	32
Table 25. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Age .....	32
Table 26. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	32
Table 27. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Gender .....	32
Table 28. Adult Gang Unit: Adult Supervision Caseload Standard verses Caseload Size ....	33
Table 29. Number of Gang-Involved Adults under Supervision by Region .....	34
Table 30. Juvenile Detention Facilities Maximum and Average Length of Stay .....	35

Table 31. Youth in Custody: Average Age and Gender by Facility .....37

Table 32. Youth in Custody: Ethnicity by Facility .....37

Table 33. Youth in Custody: Home Region by Facility .....38

Table 34. Youth in Custody: Most Serious Offense by Facility .....38

## **Mission**

***Protect community safety, reduce crime and assist victims through offender accountability and rehabilitation***

## **Vision**

***Enhancing the quality of life for San Diego County residents by creating safer communities***


## **2010 Overview**

- The department consisted of 978 sworn and 256 non-sworn staff
- The department was organized into four divisions: Juvenile Field Services, Adult Field Services, Institutional Services and Administrative Services
- The Chief Probation Officer, Administrative Manager, three Deputy Chief Probation Officers, and 12 directors administered a budget of \$171 million
- Staff were located in 17 main facilities. In addition, staff were out-stationed at community-based organizations and law enforcement offices


This report was produced by the Research Division of the San Diego County Probation Department. The data was provided by Daniel Roberts and Kevin Eccles and compiled by Darla Newman. It was designed to provide answers to commonly asked questions about the department. If you require information that is not included here, please contact Dr. Natalie Pearl at 858-514-3102 or [Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov). Additional information about programs and services delivered by the department can be found in the Annual Report at [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/probation/media\\_center.html](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/probation/media_center.html)

# OVERALL JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES

(Including Special Operations)




**Figure 1. Juvenile Population Trend on the Last Day of Each Month 2008-2010**



Over the past three years the number of youth supervised has decreased by 13%. Youth supervised reside in many areas of the county. Some areas have a higher concentration of probation youth. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probation youth were found in 2010.




Figure 2. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Youth Supervised



Youth supervised come from all over the county. The information in Figure 3 shows the breakdown by region.

**Figure 3. Youth Supervised by Region**



**Table 1. Youth Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region								
	Central		East		South		North		Total
White	395	19.3%	484	42.2%	109	9.2%	646	31.8%	1634
Hispanic	1067	52.1%	369	32.2%	858	73.0%	1101	54.2%	3395
African-American	464	22.6%	232	20.3%	131	11.1%	148	7.3%	975
Asian	81	4.0%	11	1.0%	49	4.2%	51	2.5%	192
Other	43	2.0%	54	4.3%	31	2.5%	90	4.2%	218
Total	2050	100.0%	1150	100.0%	1178	100.0%	2036	100.0%	6414

\*Excludes transient and out-of-county youth

All youth supervised in San Diego County are assessed using a validated risk-need assessment tool known as the San Diego Regional Resiliency Check-Up (SDRRC). The youth are grouped according to their score.

**Table 2. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
Central	1295	36.2%	474	28.0%	118	20.3%	165	29.5%	2052
East	664	18.6%	338	19.9%	67	11.5%	78	14.0%	1147
South	625	17.4%	347	20.4%	130	22.4%	77	13.8%	1179
North	993	27.8%	538	31.7%	266	45.8%	239	42.7%	2036
Total	3577	100.0%	1697	100.0%	581	100.0%	559	100.0%	6414

\*Excludes transient and out-of-county youth

**Table 3. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
Under 15 years	289	7.6%	138	7.7%	61	9.9%	62	10.6%	550
15 – 16 years	1281	33.3%	561	31.1%	179	29.2%	176	30.0%	2197
17 – 18 years	1883	49.0%	913	50.6%	298	48.5%	264	45.1%	3358
Over 18 years	389	10.1%	192	10.6%	76	12.4%	84	14.3%	741
Total	3842	100.0%	1804	100.0%	614	100.0%	586	100.0%	6846

**Table 4. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
White	864	22.6%	422	23.4%	193	31.5%	265	45.5%	1744
Hispanic	2089	54.5%	1003	55.7%	301	49.1%	194	33.3%	3587
African-American	698	18.2%	254	14.1%	64	10.4%	65	11.1%	1081
Asian	90	2.3%	54	3.0%	28	4.6%	32	5.5%	204
Other	97	2.4%	72	3.8%	31	4.4%	30	4.6%	230
Total	3838	100.0%	1805	100.0%	617	100.0%	586	100.0%	6846

**Table 5. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
Female	916	23.8%	467	25.9%	152	24.8%	181	30.9%	1716
Male	2926	76.2%	1337	74.1%	462	75.2%	405	69.1%	5130
Total	3842	100.0%	1804	100.0%	614	100.0%	586	100.0%	6846

# JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES


(Excluding Special Operations)

The department maintains standards for supervision. Adhering to caseload standards means that officers can engage youthful probationers in meaningful interactions that lead to behavior change. Standards are referred to as a yardstick. The caseload ratio column provides information on the actual ratio of probationers to officers.

**Table 6. Juvenile Supervision Program Caseload Yardstick versus Caseload Size**

Specialized Program	Yardstick	Caseload Ratio	% +/-
Breaking Cycles	1:50	1:50	0%
Drug Court	1:35	1:28	-20%
Informal	1:200	1:144	-28%
Placement	1:35	1:30	-15%
Sex Offender	1:30	1:30	0%
Truancy	1:50	1:47	-6%
WINGS/CAT	1:30	1:24	-33%

**Figure 4. Youth Supervised by Program**



## Criminal Justice System Statistics

The following statistics reflect the processes that bring youth to the probation department when they commit a status or criminal offense. The process begins with a referral to the probation department citing a youth's behavior and recommending intervention.


In 2010, 7,761 referrals were received by the probation department. These referrals represented 6,164 individual youth. The agencies that made a significant number of referrals are seen in Table 7.

**Table 7. Top 10 Referring Agencies of Youth to Probation**


Referring Agency	# of Referrals	Referring Agency	# of Referrals
San Diego Police Department	2,184	School Attendance Review Board	337
San Diego Sheriff's Office	1,897	San Diego Unified School District	494
Escondido Police Department	547	El Cajon Police Department	426
Oceanside Police Department	492	La Mesa Police Department	190
Chula Vista Police Department	358	Carlsbad Police Department	158

The statistics provided below are based on the total number of referrals, not the number of youth. Figure 5 shows the ethnic breakdown of the referrals made.

**Figure 5. Youth Referrals by Ethnicity**




**Figure 6. Youth Referrals by Region**




Referrals are categorized by the most serious offense type on that referral.

**Figure 7. Youth Referrals by Crime Type**




Referrals are acted on in a number of ways. Only those referrals that are sent to the District Attorney result in a petition.

**Figure 8. Youth Outcome of Referrals**




The next stage in the process is for the District Attorney’s office to file a petition that is heard by the juvenile court. In 2010, there were 4,028 petitions filed. Figure 9 shows the petitions filed by ethnicity and Figure 10 shows the region that the youth who had a petition filed resided.


**Figure 9. Status and Criminal Offense (601 and 602) Petitions by Ethnicity**



**Figure 10. Status and Criminal Offense (601 and 602) Petitions by Region**




**Figure 11. Youth Petitions by Crime Type**






Petitions can be found true by the court (a disposition called a True Finding), can be admitted true by the minor, or can be dismissed for a variety of reasons. The dispositions on petitions filed in 2010 are shown in Figure 12.

**Figure 12. Disposition of Youth Petitions Filed**



Each petition that is found or admitted true is characterized by the most serious charge on the petition. Of the 3,527 petitions that were found true in 2010, Figure 13 shows the breakdown by crime type.

**Figure 13. Petitions Filed and Found True by Crime Type**




## OUTCOMES

### Recidivism

Of the 2,519 youth who terminated probation in 2010, 1,778, or 71% terminated without committing a new law violation. The recidivism rate reflected the percent of youth who terminated probation who committed a new offense. For 2010, the recidivism percent rate was 29%.

**Figure 14. Number of Juveniles who Recidivated 2008-2010**



**Figure 15. Number of Juveniles who Left Probation 2008-2010**





Figure 16. Juvenile Recidivism Rate 2008-2010




# JUVENILE SPECIAL OPERATIONS

## Who Probation Supervised in 2010

- 679 juveniles were supervised by Special Operations on December 31, 2010
- 1,264 juveniles were supervised by Special Operations throughout the year
- Average Age 16.8 years
- 145 (11.5%) Female
- 1,119 (88.5%) Male
- 14.9% Caucasian
- 16.2% African-American
- 64.3% Hispanic
- 2.9% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 1.7% Other

**Figure 17. Special Operations Juveniles Supervised by Region**



The 1,264 juveniles who were supervised by Special Operations in 2010 were a diverse group of individuals. Table 8 shows the breakdown of juveniles supervised in Special Operations by region and ethnicity.

**Table 8. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region									
	Central		East		South		North		Total	
White	42	10.4%	57	33.1%	10	5.2%	68	15.1%	177	
Hispanic	243	60.3%	56	32.5%	153	80.1%	335	74.2%	787	
African-American	98	24.3%	45	26.2%	20	10.5%	31	6.9%	194	
Asian	15	3.8%	8	4.6%	6	3.2%	8	1.8%	37	
Other	5	1.2%	7	3.6%	2	1.0%	9	2.0%	22	
	403	100.0%	173	100.0%	191	100.0%	451	100%	1218	

\* Excludes transient and out-of-county youth

**Table 9. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level						
	High		Medium		Low		Total
Central	375	33.8%	23	24.0%	5	38.5%	403
East	142	12.8%	26	27.1%	4	30.8%	172
South	168	15.2%	21	21.8%	3	23.0%	192
North	424	38.2%	26	27.1%	1	7.7%	451
Total	1109	100.0%	96	100.0%	13	100.0%	1218

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 10. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level						
	High		Medium		Low		Total
Under 15 years	14	1.2%	6	6.0%	1	7.7%	21
15-16 years	159	13.8%	17	17.2%	0	0.0%	176
17-18 years	572	49.7%	37	37.4%	9	69.2%	618
Over 18 years	407	35.3%	39	39.4%	3	23.1%	449
Total	1152	100.0%	99	100.0%	13	100.0%	1264


**Table 11. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level						
	High		Medium		Low		Total
White	170	14.8%	16	16.2%	2	15.4%	188
Hispanic	750	65.1%	55	55.6%	7	53.8%	812
African-American	186	16.2%	15	15.2%	3	23.1%	204
Asian	26	2.2%	10	10.0%	1	7.7%	37
Other	21	1.7%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	23
Total	1152	100.0%	99	100.0%	13	100.0%	1264

**Table 12. Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level						
	High		Medium		Low		Total
Female	135	11.7%	9	9.1%	1	7.7%	145
Male	1017	88.3%	90	90.9%	12	92.3%	1119
Total	1152	100.0%	99	100.0%	13	100.0%	1264

Figure 18. Map Showing Concentration of Special Operations: Juveniles Supervised




**Table 13. Youth Supervised by Risk Level and Specialized Programs**

Specialized Program	Risk Level				
	High	Medium	Low	Not Scored	Total
CROP	166	6	1	12	185
Gang	275	28	2	1	306
YOU	118	3	0	1	122
Total	559	37	3	13	613

\*One day snapshot of youth in specialized programs on December 31, 2010

The following figures show the breakdown of youth who are in each program with the Special Operations division.

**Figure 19. Youth Supervised in Specialized Programs\***



\*One day snapshot of youth in specialized programs on December 31, 2010

### Special Operations: Juvenile Caseload Standards


The department maintains standards for supervision. Adhering to caseload standards means that officers engage youthful probationers in meaningful interactions that lead to behavior change. Standards are referred to as a yardstick. The caseload ratio column provides information on the actual ratio of probationers to officers.

**Table 14. Special Ops: Juvenile Supervision Yardstick verses Caseload Size**

Specialized Program	Yardstick	Caseload Ratio	% +/-
Youthful Offender Unit (YOU)	1:25	1:20	-18%
Gang Suppression Unit (GSU)	1:40	1:39	-3%
Community Response Officer Program (CROP)	1:40	1:41	2%

When a youth is placed under supervision he or she is characterized by the most serious crime or action that led them to being under supervision. Status offenses are those actions which are only illegal if engaged in by a minor.

**Figure 20. Youth Supervised by Crime Type**





## Special Operations: Juvenile Gang Statistics

Probation officers supervise juvenile gang members throughout the county. Officers perform intensive supervision and case management that includes 4<sup>th</sup> waiver searches, curfew checks, drug testing, and face-to-face contacts with clients at school, community programs, employment, and at home. Ninety percent (90%) of juveniles assigned to gang supervision have been assessed as high risk, 9% are assessed as medium risk and 1% as low risk.

When the Probation Department provides information on gang members in the community under probation supervision, three groups are identified:


1. Youth who are supervised by our specialized gang suppression officers. Because only a certain number of supervision slots are available this number does not vary much over time.
2. Juvenile probationers who had, as conditions of their probation, prohibitions against certain activities thought to show affiliation with a gang.
3. Juveniles who have been documented as gang members or gang associates by local law enforcement and catalogued by the CalGang system. Percents are not given due to the fact that a youth can be in more than one category.

**Table 15. Number of Gang-Involved Juveniles under Supervision by Region\***

Region	Supervised By Gang Unit	With Gang Registration Conditions	Identified as Gang Member or Associate
Central	98	47	106
East	33	12	41
South	41	27	49
North	131	96	157
Total	303	182	353

\* Percents are not given due to the fact that an offender can be in more than one category

Figure 21. Map of Youth Supervised by the Gang Unit




# ADULT FIELD SERVICES

## Who Probation Supervised in 2010

- 16,417 adults were supervised on December 31, 2010
- 22,660 adults were supervised throughout the year
- Average Age 35.4 years
- 5,363 (23.7%) Female
- 17,297 (76.3%) Male
- 40% Caucasian
- 17% African-American
- 36% Hispanic
- 4% Asian/Pacific Islander


**Figure 22. Adult Population Trend on the Last Day of Each Month 2008-2010 \***



\* Includes Adult Gang Unit

Over the past three years, the number of adults supervised has decreased by 14%.

**Figure 23. Percentage of Adults Supervised by Region**




The 22,660 adults who were supervised in 2010 were a diverse group of individuals, both ethnically and geographically. Table 16 shows the breakdown of adult probationers by region and ethnicity.

**Table 16. Adults Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region								
	Central		East		South		North		Total
White	2333	36.6%	1783	55.2%	740	22.0%	2445	49.8%	7301
Hispanic	1806	28.3%	690	21.4%	1976	58.9%	1741	35.4%	6213
African-American	1738	27.3%	566	17.5%	381	11.3%	347	7.1%	3032
Asian	326	5.2%	64	2.0%	180	5.4%	172	3.5%	742
Other	168	2.6%	126	3.9%	83	2.4%	208	4.2%	539
Total	6371	100.0%	3229	100.0%	3360	100.0%	4913	100.0%	17873

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Figure 24. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Adults Supervised



Adults supervised in San Diego County are assessed to determine the likelihood that they will offend again. In the beginning of 2009, a validated risk-need assessment tool known as the COMPAS was implemented. For those probationers who began their probation prior to early 2009, the Federal Salient Factor Score was used to assess risk. Probationers were grouped according to their score as shown in Tables 17, 18, 19, and 20.

**Table 17. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
Central	1598	38.0%	1709	36.1%	2897	34.5%	167	30.3%	6371
East	794	18.9%	858	18.1%	1471	17.5%	106	19.3%	3229
South	731	17.4%	862	18.2%	1645	19.6%	122	22.2%	3360
North	1080	25.7%	1300	27.6%	2378	28.4%	155	28.2%	4913
Total	4203	100.0%	4729	100.0%	8391	100.0%	550	100.0%	17873

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 18. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
18-24 years	1446	27.4%	1289	22.0%	1561	14.4%	133	19.6%	4429
25-34 years	1808	34.2%	2063	35.2%	3839	35.4%	204	30.0%	7914
35-44 years	1029	19.5%	1277	21.8%	2536	23.4%	158	23.2%	5000
Over 45 years	998	18.9%	1235	21.0%	2899	26.8%	185	27.2%	5317
Total	5281	100.0%	5864	100.0%	10835	100.0%	680	100.0%	22660

**Table 19. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**


Ethnicity	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
White	2032	38.5%	2334	39.8%	4450	41.1%	293	43.1%	9109
Hispanic	1753	33.1%	2076	35.4%	4116	38.0%	255	37.5%	8200
African-American	1244	23.6%	1071	18.2%	1389	12.8%	82	12.0%	3786
Asian	117	2.2%	197	3.4%	506	4.7%	25	3.7%	845
Other	135	2.6%	186	3.2%	374	3.4%	25	3.7%	720
Total	5281	100.0%	5864	100.0%	10835	100.0%	680	100.0%	22660

**Table 20. Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
Female	1025	19.4%	1438	24.5%	2724	25.1%	176	25.9%	5363
Male	4256	80.6%	4426	75.5%	8111	74.9%	504	74.1%	17297
Total	5281	100.0%	5864	100.0%	10835	100.0%	680	100.0%	22660

There are four supervision levels: High, Medium, and Low Risk. The fourth level of supervision were those offenders who fell under Proposition 36 (PC1210) that allows first- and second-time nonviolent, simple drug possession offenders the opportunity to receive substance abuse treatment instead of incarceration.

**Figure 25. Adults Supervised by Supervision Level**



**Table 21. Adult Supervised by Risk Level and Supervision Level**

Supervision Level	Risk Level								
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total
High Risk	2372	45%	550	9%	653	6%	124	18%	3699
Medium Risk	704	13%	1519	26%	845	8%	49	7%	3117
Low Risk	1547	29%	3097	53%	8543	79%	454	67%	13641
PC 1210	517	10%	563	10%	657	6%	44	6%	1781
Other *	141	3%	135	2%	137	1%	9	1%	422
Total	5140	100%	5729	100%	10698	100%	671	100%	22660

\* Offenders fall into a variety of categories including unassigned, ended year on supervisor case load without supervision level or last caseload assignment was to Investigations

## Caseload Standards

The department created standards for supervision. Adhering to caseload standards means that officers can engage probationers in meaningful interactions that lead to behavior change. The caseload ratio column provides information on the actual ratio of probationers to officers.


**Table 22. Adult Supervision Caseload Standard versus Caseload Size**

Supervision Level	Caseload Standard	Caseload Ratio	% +/-
High Risk	1:50	1:52	1.0%
Medium Risk	1:150	1:123	-18.0%
Low Risk	1:1400	1:985	-32.5%
PC 1210	1:125	1:564	451.0%




When an adult is placed under supervision he or she is characterized by the most serious crime that led them to being under supervision.

**Figure 26. Percentage of Adults Supervised by Crime Type**




The law requires that sex offenders convicted of certain offenses register with local law enforcement as a “registered sex offender.” Some of these offenders are under probation supervision. They are required by state law to be assessed for risk of committing another sex offense using a tool known as the “Static 99.” Figure 27 shows the registered sex offenders under supervision in 2010 by assessed risk level.

**Figure 27. Percentage of Adult Sex Offenders Supervised by Assessed Risk Level**






**Figure 28. Adults under Supervision – Ending Status**



**DUI OFFENDERS**

On any given day in 2010, the department supervised 1,002 DUI offenders on specialized caseloads. DUI offenders are eligible for supervision on these caseloads when they commit felony DUI offenses. Some high risk offenders wore a SCRAM bracelet which detects alcohol abuse around the clock. Figure 28 shows the DUI offenders under supervision by region.

**Figure 29. Adult Offenders on DUI Enforcement Caseloads by Region**




## OUTCOMES


### Recidivism

Of the 6,478 adults who terminated probation in 2010, 4,482, or 69% terminated without committing a new law violation. The recidivism rate reflects the percent of adults who terminated probation who committed a new offense. For 2010, our recidivism rate was 31%.


**Figure 30. Number of Adults who Recidivated 2008-2010**



**Figure 31. Number of Adults who Left Probation 2008-2010**



**Figure 32. Adult Recidivism Rate 2008-2010**




# ADULT GANG UNIT

## Who Probation Supervised In Special Operations

- 432 adults were supervised by the Adult Gang Unit on December 31, 2010
- 661 adults were supervised by the Adult Gang Unit throughout the year
- Average Age 23.8 years
- 34 (5%) Females
- 627 (95%) Males
- 4.4% Caucasian
- 21.6% African-American
- 65.5% Hispanic
- 5.7% Asian/Pacific Islander

**Figure 33. Percentage of Adults Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit by Region**




The 661 adults who were supervised by the Adult Gang Unit in 2010 were a diverse group of individuals. Table 23 shows the breakdown of adult probationers by region and ethnicity.

**Table 23. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region								
	Central		East		South		North		Total
White	5	2%	9	11%	3	2%	6	4%	23
Hispanic	118	53%	39	48%	97	83%	136	80%	390
African-American	75	34%	30	36%	15	13%	7	4%	127
Asian	19	9%	3	4%	2	2%	11	6%	35
Other	5	2%	1	1%	0	0%	11	6%	17
Total	222	100%	82	100%	117	100%	171	100%	592

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Figure 34. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Adults Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit



All adults supervised by the Adult Gang Unit in San Diego County are assessed to determine the likelihood that they will offend again. In the beginning of 2009 a validated risk need assessment tool known as the COMPAS was implemented. For those probationers who began their probation prior to early 2009, the Federal Salient Factor Score was used to assess risk. Probationers are grouped according to their score. These groupings are shown in Tables 24, 25, 26 and 27.

**Table 24. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	
Central	124	36.0%	51	36.4%	40	44.9%	7	36.8%	222	
East	42	12.2%	27	19.3%	11	12.4%	2	10.5%	82	
South	115	33.5%	34	24.3%	21	23.6%	1	5.2%	171	
North	63	18.3%	28	20.0%	17	19.1%	9	47.5%	117	
Total	344	100%	140	100%	89	100%	19	100%	592	

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 25. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	
18-24 years	293	75.5%	110	73.8%	51	49.5%	15	71.4%	469	
25-34 years	82	21.2%	32	21.5%	45	43.7%	6	28.6%	165	
35-44 years	10	2.6%	5	3.4%	6	5.8%	0	0.0%	21	
Over 45 years	3	0.7%	2	1.3%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	6	
Total	388	100.0%	149	100.0%	103	100.0%	21	100.0%	661	

**Table 26. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	
White	13	3.4%	4	2.7%	12	11.6%	0	0.0%	29	
Hispanic	268	69.1%	101	67.8%	47	45.6%	17	81.0%	433	
African-American	84	21.6%	31	20.8%	24	23.3%	4	19.0%	143	
Asian	16	4.1%	9	6.0%	13	12.6%	0	0.0%	38	
Other	7	1.8%	4	2.7%	7	6.8%	0	0.0%	18	
Total	388	100.0%	149	100.0%	103	99.9%	21	100.0%	661	

**Table 27. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	
Female	19	4.9%	6	4.0%	9	8.7%	0	0.0%	34	
Male	369	95.1%	143	96.0%	94	91.3%	21	100.0%	627	
Total	388	100.0%	149	100%	103	100.0%	21	100.0%	661	

### Adult Gang Unit: Adult Caseload Standards

The department created standards for supervision. Adhering to caseload standards means that officers can engage probationers in meaningful interactions that lead to behavior change. The caseload ratio column provides information on the actual ratio of probationers to officers.


**Table 28. Adult Gang Unit: Adult Supervision Caseload Standard versus Caseload Size**

Supervision Level	Caseload Standard	Caseload Ratio	% +/-
High Risk	1:50	1:46	-8%

### Adult Gang Unit: Adult Supervision by Most Serious Crime Type

When an adult is placed under supervision by the Gang Suppression Unit, he or she is characterized by the most serious crime that led them to being under supervision.

**Figure 35. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Crime Type**



### Adult Gang Unit: Adult Supervision Statistics

Probation officers supervise adult gang members throughout the county. Officers perform intensive supervision and case management that includes 4<sup>th</sup> waiver searches, curfew checks, drug testing, and face-to-face contacts with clients at school, community programs, employment, and at home.

The court can impose the requirement to register with local law enforcement as a gang member. The number of adults shown in the "gang registration" column had this condition placed on them by the court. Adults in the "identified as a gang member or associate"


column had been documented by law enforcement as being either a gang member or a gang associate. These adults have been entered into statewide gang database

**Table 29. Number of Gang-Involved Adults under Supervision by Region\***

Region	Supervised By Gang Unit	With Gang Registration Conditions	Identified as Gang Member or Associate
Central	222	85	243
East	82	21	80
South	117	37	143
North	171	73	196
Total	592	216	662

\* Percents are not given due to the fact that an offender can be in more than one category

**Figure 36. Adult Gang Unit: Adults Supervised by Risk Level**






# INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

The department operates five 24-hour institutions. **Kearny Mesa and East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facilities** house boys and girls while they are awaiting trial, placement in a treatment facility, a return to home, foster care, or as a short-term placement for violating their probation conditions.

Two detention facilities admit youth directly from arresting agencies throughout the county as well as youth who are arrested by probation officers for failing to comply with their conditions of probation. In 2010 there were 6117 bookings into the two detention facilities. The average length of stay for youth booked into juvenile hall and who are not released within 72 hours was 58 days. 1026 were booked and released in less than 72 hours. The average monthly census for 2010 is shown in Figure 37. The maximum and average length of stay is shown on Table 30.

**Figure 37. Average Daily Attendance – Juvenile Detention Facilities**




**Table 30. Juvenile Detention Facilities Maximum and Average Length of Stay**

Institution	Maximum Length of Stay	Average Length of Stay
KMJDF	668	16
EMJDF	474	39
JRF	148	45
CB	379	132
GRF	158	53


Youth were detained in juvenile detention facilities for a variety of reasons. Both pre- and post-dispositional youth were held. Seventy-six percent of all youth held in detention facilities were post-dispositional. In 2010, 3% were part of the YOU program, 18% had been committed to Breaking Cycles and 22% were short term commitments (STOP).

**Figure 38. Reason for Detention at East Mesa and Kearny Mesa**



The **Girl's Rehabilitation Facility** houses up to 50 girls for an average of four months focusing on behavior modification and substance abuse treatment. The **Juvenile Ranch Facility and Camp Barrett** are camp programs for boys offering substance abuse treatment, job training, education, and pro-social behavior. The camp programs have a capacity of 352 youth on any given day. The Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of the Juvenile Ranch Facility (JRF), Camp Barrett (CB) for boys and Girls Rehabilitation Facility (GRF) are divided among the facilities as shown in Figure 39.

**Figure 39. Average Daily Attendance at the Juvenile Camps**



**Table 31. Youth in Custody: Average Age and Gender by Facility \***

Institution	Average Age	Male	%	Female	%	Total
KMJDF	15	143	65%	76	35%	219
EMJDF	15	229	100%	0	0%	229
JFR	15	134	100%	0	0%	134
CB	16	135	100%	0	0%	135
GRF	15	0	0%	30	100%	30

\*Represents average population on any given day

**Table 32. Youth in Custody: Ethnicity by Facility \***

Institution	White	Hispanic	African American	Asian	Other	Total
KMJDF	50	110	51	3	5	219
EMJDF	22	150	44	3	10	229
JFR	22	95	15	1	1	134
CB	17	83	33	0	2	135
GRF	6	16	5	1	2	30

\*Represents average population on any given day

**Table 33. Youth in Custody: Home Region by Facility \***

Region	Central	East	South	North	Other	Total
KMJDF	64	35	24	89	7	219
EMJDF	83	31	29	76	10	229
JRF	43	22	14	54	1	124
CB	36	20	12	60	7	135
GRF	9	6	4	11	0	30

\*Represents average population on any given day

**Table 34. Youth in Custody: Most Serious Offense by Facility \***

Institution	Crime Against Person	Crime Against Property	Drug Offense	Weapon Offense	Status Offense	Other	Total
KMJDF	103	65	22	8	2	19	219
EMJDF	116	57	16	20	2	18	229
JRF	47	50	14	11	3	9	134
CB	64	40	15	7	0	9	135
GRF	15	7	5	1	0	2	30

\*Represents average population on any given day